



## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/674,975 Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

Agus et al

	Ungar	1642	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC	personnel):	•	
(1) Ungar	(3)		
(2) M. Larson	(4)		
Date of Interview			
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative	/e]	·
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)	e)⊠ No. If yes, brief descrip	tion:	
Claim(s) discussed: All pending			
Identification of prior art discussed:  None			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments:			was reached, or
Exr called to request an oral election response to the new	ly constituted restriction require	ment. Dr. Larso	n declined to
make an oral response and requested a written restriction	requirement. Exr pointed out the	hat the method (	claims had been
rejoined to the product claims and that the restriction was NOS 1 and 2 and that she had previously provisionally ele			
response and requested a written restriction requirement.		90 00000	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amerallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	ndments which the examiner agr copy of the amendments that v	reed would rende vould render the	er the claims claims allowable is
i) $\square$ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep	arate record of the substance of	the interview (if	box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORM INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See Malready been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Recommendations of the summary of	PEP section 713.04). If a reply ROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO	to the last Office FILE A STATEN	e action has MENT OF THE
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is			
an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner	's signature, if re	equired